



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/409,748	10/01/1999	DANIEL SCHUTZER	CITI0127	5805

27510 7590 01/02/2003

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
607 14TH STREET, N.W.
SUITE 900
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

PHAM, HUNG Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/409,748

Applicant(s)

SCHUTZER, DANIEL

Examiner

HUNG Q PHAM

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/409,748	Applicant(s) SCHUTZER, DANIEL	
	Examiner HUNG Q PHAM	Art Unit 2172	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) HUNG Q PHAM. (3)_____.
- (2) TIEP NGUYEN. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 17 December 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 3, 5, 8, and 12.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check the appropriate box at the bottom of the Form which informs the applicant that the submission of a separate record of the substance of the interview as a supplement to the Form is not required.

It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: As requested by applicant's representative, an interview before an official action was set up between the examiner and the applicant's representative. Through the interview, the examiner agrees that the amendment overcomes the final rejection and provides the applicant's representative some references that relate to claims 1, 3, and 5 such as 6,230,156 and 6,266,094. Claims 8, and 12, the examiner has not found the prior art that relates to the last feature: the at least one e-mail message comprises a plurality of e-mail messages... and needs to update the search.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The request filed on 11/12/2002 for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 09/409,748 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

2. The pending claims are 1-5, and 7-14, applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, and 7-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: there is a duplicated sentence: *wherein the at least one Web page comprises a sub-plurality of the plurality of Web pages*. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hussey [USP 6,230,156 B1] in view of Navin-Chandra et al. [USP 6,275,820 B1].

Regarding to claim 1, Hussey teaches a method of processing user requests clients to submit requests to a server via electronic mail, the results of which are typically viewed at a later time (Hussey, Col. 3, lines 33-63). As shown in FIG. 3, an Email message with a set of fields such as Sender, Receiver... and Email Message Text that includes an actual SQL (Hussey, Col. 8, line 19-Col. 9, line 43). As shown in FIG. 2, the email interface 30 is configured to periodically logon to the email system 20 in order to check the electronic mail box of the SQL server 22. The technique as taught by Hussey indicates the step of *receiving at least one search term via e-mail*. As shown in FIG. 7, after checking the Email for validity, the SQL command in the mail is submitted to SQL Request Processor at step 210 as the step of *issuing a search request to a search engine using the at least one search term*, the result is formatted at step 214, for example, formatting the result set of an SQL query as an attached spreadsheet file as the step of *receiving the hit list from the search engine; bundling a copy of the result into an e-mail message*. At step 216, the email response builder 44 generates a response email message to be issued to the originator of the corresponding email SQL request as the step of *forwarding the e-mail message to an end-user's terminal wherein the copy of the result may be reviewed by the end-user*. Hussey does not disclose the hit list includes Web

Art Unit: 2172

pages, also the step of *retrieving at least one Web page based on the hit list*; and bundling a *copy of Web page* into e-mail for reviewing by the end-user. Navin-Chandra teaches a method for searching in the Internet (Navin-Chandra, Col. 1, lines 15-23). According to Navin-Chandra method, a user operating at computer 202 submits a query to MSE 262 via an ISP 204. MSE 262 uses the query to determine which IRs to access. It then parses and reformats the query into formats appropriate for the respective search engines on computers 210, 220 and 230, e.g., MSE 262 subsequently forwards an appropriately formatted query to the respective search engines. Each SE then interrogates their respective indices of the associated IRs and compiles a respective list of hits with associated ranks and summaries as shown in more detail in FIGS. 2A, 2B and 2C. The MSE 262 then uses "fusion" method to combine the results from the search engines A, B and C. The combined results are returned to computer 202 (Navin-Chandra, Col. 6, lines 30-65). Navin-Chandra further discloses the results may be converted into a facsimile, e-mail or other document format specified by the user and transmitted to the location specified by the user (Navin-Chandra, Col. 9, lines 1-7). The Navin-Chandra technique indicates the hit list includes Web pages, *retrieving at least one Web page based on the hit list*; and bundling a *copy of Web page* into e-mail for reviewing by the end-user. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Hussey method by applying the technique of searching in the Internet that includes the hit list includes Web pages, retrieving at least one Web page based on the hit list; bundling a copy of Web page into e-mail for reviewing as taught by Navin-Chandra, and by combining the two technique,

Art Unit: 2172

a search for information in the Internet could be performed by sending a request via e-mail.

Regarding to claim 9, Hussey, and Navin-Chandra teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, but fails to disclose: *the copy of the at least one Web page bundled in the e-mail message may be reviewed by the end-user when the end-user's terminal is not connected to the Web*. However, by using conventional email software such as outlook, after downloading a message, the messages are in the computer. This indicates the e-mail message is just an ordinary file in the file system. Thus it can be opened and reviewed by user when the user's terminal is not connected to the Web. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Navin-Chandra method to include the technique of reviewing the e-mail message when not connecting to the Web in order to review a Web page in the body of the message.

Regarding to claim 10, Hussey, and Navin-Chandra teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, Navin-Chandra further discloses: *the bundled at least one Web page includes a ink to a non-retrieved Web page, wherein the non-retrieved Web page can be retrieved directly via connection to the Internet* (Navin-Chandra, Col. 2, lines 23-49).

Regarding to claim 11, Hussey, and Navin-Chandra teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 10, but fails to disclose: *the non-retrieved Web page can be retrieved upon receiving another search term and issuing another search request to the search engine using the another term*. However, a Web page could be retrieved by using a search term or a URL. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Hussey and Navin-Chandra method to include the step of issuing another search request to the search engine using another term to retrieve a non-retrieved Web page in order to search a particular Web page in the WWW.

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hussey [USP 6,230,156 B1] in view of Navin-Chandra et al. [USP 6,275,820 B1] and Mantha et al. [USP 6,163,779].

Regarding to claim 2, Hussey, and Navin-Chandra teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, but fails to disclose the step of *receiving a number representative of a depth in which the depth is the amount another Web page is removed from the at least one Web page; bundling a copy of each link between the other Web page and the at least one Web page into the e-mail message*. Mantha teaches a method for copying and saving a Web page according to a desired category to facilitate subsequent retrieval and display of the page (Mantha, Col. 2, lines 3-5). The copy of the Web page and each of its embedded objects will be saved on a client hard drive (Mantha, Col. 2,

lines 12-14). The Mantha technique uses a running counter 72 to maintain the number of copies of the embedded objects in a HTML page (Mantha, Fig. 9; Col. 10, lines 5-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Hussey, and Navin-Chandra method by using the technique of Mantha of maintaining the number of copies of the embedded objects by a running counter in order to send an interesting Web page and all of its embedded links with a counter to indicate the number of the embedded links to a friend or associate when a user feels they should know about.

7. Claims 3, 5, 7, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navin-Chandra et al. [USP 6,275,820 B1].

Regarding to claim 3, Navin-Chandra teaches a method and system for searching in the Internet (Navin-Chandra, Col. 1, lines 15-23). According to Navin-Chandra method, a user operating at computer 202 submits a query to MSE 262 via an ISP 204. MSE 262 uses the query to determine which IRs to access. It then parses and reformats the query into formats appropriate for the respective search engines on computers 210, 220 and 230, e.g., MSE 262 subsequently forwards an appropriately formatted query to the respective search engines. Each SE then interrogates their respective indices of the associated IRs and compiles a respective list of hits with associated ranks and summaries as shown in more detail in FIGS. 2A, 2B and 2C. The

Art Unit: 2172

MSE 262 then uses "fusion" method to combine the results from the search engines A, B and C (Col. 6, lines 30-58). The Navin-Chandra metasearch engine further includes retrieving means for requesting respective original documents corresponding to plurality of relevant search engine results from those search engines by utilizing respective Uniform Resource Location address (Col. 11, lines 58-67, and Col. 12, lines 62-64). The technique as discussed above indicates the steps of *receiving an address associated with the at least one Web page; retrieving the at least one Web page*. Navin-Chandra does not explicitly teach the steps of *automatically bundling a copy of the at least one Web page into the first e-mail message; and automatically forwarding the first e-mail message to a user's terminal wherein the copy of the at least one Web page may be retrieved and reviewed by the user at the user's terminal*. However, as illustrated by Navin-Chandra, the results may be transmitted to the user across lines 205 and 203 or transmitted through an alternate mode module 208 in FIG. 2, which is the user's specified mode of transmission. For example, the results may be converted into a facsimile, e-mail or other document format specified by the user and transmitted to the location specified by the user (Col. 9, lines 1-7). This indicates the steps of *automatically bundling a copy of the at least one Web page into the first e-mail message; and automatically forwarding the first e-mail message to a user's terminal wherein the copy of the at least one Web page may be retrieved and reviewed by the user at the user's terminal*. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Navin-Chandra technique by including the steps of automatically bundling the Web page into the email then

forwarding the email, and by doing this, a user could query the Internet at one time and retrieve the search result at another time.

Regarding to claim 5, Navin-Chandra teaches a method and system for searching in the Internet (Navin-Chandra, Col. 1, lines 15-23). According to Navin-Chandra method, a user operating at computer 202 submits a query to MSE 262 via an ISP 204 (Col. 6, lines 30-34). The query could be in batch mode, which contains the following information: (1) the query, (2) the particular information resources that should be contacted, (3) the time interval or periodicity in which to run the batch query, and (4) the performed mode of receiving the results (Col. 8, lines 44-53). This indicates the steps of *receiving at least one search term at the client terminal; bundling the at least one search term into a first message at the client terminal; forwarding the first message from the client terminal to the server*. After receiving the query, MSE 262 uses the query to determine which IRs to access. It then parses and reformats the query into formats appropriate for the respective search engines on computers 210, 220 and 230, e.g., MSE 262 subsequently forwards an appropriately formatted query to the respective search engines (Col. 6, lines 34-39). This illustrates the step of *issuing the at least one search term as a search request from the server to a search engine*. After receiving the search term, each SE then interrogates their respective indices of the associated IRs and compiles a respective list of hits with associated ranks and summaries as shown in FIGS. 2A, 2B and 2C (Col. 6, lines 30-48). Upon reception of the result lists, the MSE 262 will recover the hits, which are provided in the form of a cross reference to the

location, i.e., a URL, of a particular IR to which the hit is associated for determining the documents that are pertinent to the query. The MSE 262 then communicates with the particular IRs storing the document or other item of interest for downloading to the computer 260 (Col. 7, lines 10-30). This technique indicates the steps of *receiving links to a plurality of Web pages that are associated with the at least one search term at the server; issuing a request for at least one of the plurality of Web pages; receiving the at least one Web page by the server*. Navin-Chandra does not explicitly teach the steps of *the server automatically copying the at least one Web page into at least one e-mail message by the server; and the server automatically forwarding the at least one e-mail message from the server to the client*. However, as illustrated by Navin-Chandra, the results as discussed are downloaded, and may be transmitted to the user across lines 205 and 203 or transmitted through an alternate mode module 208 in FIG. 2, which is the user's specified mode of transmission. For example, the results may be converted into a facsimile, e-mail or other document format specified by the user and transmitted to the location specified by the user (Col. 8, line 54-Col. 9, line 7). This indicates the steps: *the server automatically copying the at least one Web page into at least one e-mail message by the server; and the server automatically forwarding the at least one e-mail message from the server to the client*. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Navin-Chandra technique by including the steps of automatically copying the Web page into the email then forwarding the email, and by doing this, a user could query the Internet at one time and retrieve the search result at another time.

Regarding to claim 7, Navin-Chandra teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Navin-Chandra further discloses: *the at least one Web page comprises a sub-plurality of the plurality of Web pages* (Col. 5, lines 14-24, and Col. 2, lines 23-40).

Regarding to claim 13, Navin-Chandra teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Navin-Chandra further discloses: *the server is an e-mail server* (FIG. 2, Col. 9, lines 1-7).

Regarding to claim 14, Navin-Chandra teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, but fails to disclose: *the client terminal is off-line with the Internet, and the server is connected to the Internet*. However, by using conventional email software such as outlook, after downloading a message, the messages are in the computer. This indicates the e-mail message is just an ordinary file in the file system. Thus it can be opened and reviewed by user when the user's terminal is not connected to the Web. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Navin-Chandra method to include the technique of reviewing the e-mail message when not connecting to the Web in order to review a Web page in the body of the message.

8. Claims 4, 8, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navin-Chandra et al. [USP 6,275,820 B1] in view of Mantha et al. [USP 6,163,779].

Regarding to claim 4, Navin-Chandra teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 3, but fails to disclose: *generating the address based upon a request to review the at least one Web page that is linked to a copy of another Web page wherein the copy of the other Web page is bundled in a second e-mail message; and forwarding the second-email message to the user's terminal wherein the copy of the other Web page may be retrieved and reviewed by the user at the user's terminal*. Mantha teaches a method for copying and saving a Web page according to a desired category to facilitate subsequent retrieval and display of the page (Mantha, Col. 2, lines 3-5). The copy of the Web page and each of its embedded objects will be saved on a client hard drive (Mantha, Col. 2, lines 12-14). Mantha further discloses: a copy of a Web page will be saved to the client local storage and several linked list for the hypertext references will be created in order to save the embedded objects of the Web page (Mantha, Col. 2, lines 45-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Navin-Chandra technique by including the steps of generating the address and forwarding the second email message as taught by Mantha, and by doing this, a user could query the Internet at one time and off-line retrieve the search result at another time.

Regarding to claim 8, Navin-Chandra teaches a method and system for searching in the Internet (Navin-Chandra, Col. 1, lines 15-23). According to Navin-Chandra method, a user operating at computer 202 submits a query to MSE 262 via an ISP 204 (Navin-Chandra, Col. 6, lines 30-34). The query could be in batch mode, which contains the following information: (1) the query, (2) the particular information resources that should be contacted, (3) the time interval or periodicity in which to run the batch query, and (4) the performed mode of receiving the results (Navin-Chandra, Col. 8, lines 44-53). This indicates the steps of *receiving at least one search term at the client terminal; bundling the at least one search term into a first message at the client terminal; forwarding the first message from the client terminal to the server*. After receiving the query, MSE 262 uses the query to determine which IRs to access. It then parses and reformats the query into formats appropriate for the respective search engines on computers 210, 220 and 230, e.g., MSE 262 subsequently forwards an appropriately formatted query to the respective search engines (Navin-Chandra, Col. 6, lines 34-39). This illustrates the step of *issuing the at least one search term as a search request from the server to a search engine*. After receiving the search term, each SE then interrogates their respective indices of the associated IRs and compiles a respective list of hits with associated ranks and summaries as shown in FIGS. 2A, 2B and 2C (Navin-Chandra, Col. 6, lines 30-48). Upon reception of the result lists, the MSE 262 will recover the hits, which are provided in the form of a cross reference to the location, i.e., a URL, of a particular IR to which the hit is associated for determining the documents that are pertinent to the query. The MSE 262 then communicates with the particular IRs storing the document, or other item

of interest for downloading to the computer 260 (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 10-30). As shown in FIG. 1, IRs 140 and 150 depict browseable information sources. Access to IRs 140 and 150 is generally made directly via an appropriate Uniform Resource Locator (URL) or by cross references, i.e., a hypertext links, from other IRs (Navin-Chandra, Col. 5, lines 14-24). A hypertext link appears as a word or phrase distinguishable from the surrounding text by a color or format distinction, or both. A user is able to click on a hypertext link and be transferred to another information service, which is often remote from the site with the originating hypertext link. Through the use of many such hypertext links, sites with similar content can be easily cross-referenced by the web developer allowing a user quick access to supplementary information that is distributed across the Internet (Navin-Chandra, Col. 2, lines 23-40). The technique as discussed indicates the steps of *receiving links to a plurality of Web pages that are associated with the at least one search term at the server; issuing a request for at least one of the plurality of Web pages, wherein the at least one Web page comprises a sub-plurality of the plurality of Web pages; receiving the at least one Web page by the server.* Navin-Chandra does not explicitly teach the steps of *copying the at least one Web page into at least one e-mail message by the server; and forwarding the at least one e-mail message from the server to the client; wherein the at least one e-mail message comprises a plurality of e-mail messages,* and fails to teach: *at least one of the sub-plurality of Web pages is copied into one of the plurality of e-mail messages.* However, as illustrated by Navin-Chandra, the results as discussed are downloaded, and may be transmitted to the user across lines 205 and 203, or transmitted through an alternate mode module 208 in FIG. 2, which is the user's specified mode of

Art Unit: 2172

transmission. For example, the results may be converted into a facsimile, e-mail, or other document format specified by the user, and transmitted to the location specified by the user (Navin-Chandra, Col. 8, line 54-Col. 9, line 7). This indicates the steps of *copying the at least one Web page into at least one e-mail message by the server; and forwarding the at least one e-mail message from the server to the client; wherein the at least one e-mail message comprises a plurality of e-mail messages.*

Mantha teaches a method for copying and saving a Web page according to a desired category to facilitate subsequent retrieval and display of the page (Mantha, Col. 2, lines 3-5). The copy of the Web page and each of its embedded objects will be saved on a client hard drive (Mantha, Col. 2, lines 12-14). Mantha further discloses: a copy of a Web page will be saved to the client local storage and several linked list for the hypertext references will be created in order to save the embedded objects of the Web page (Mantha, Col. 2, lines 45-62). Thus, the Navin-Chandra could be modified by downloading the embedded objects of the document from the IRs, and by using the Mantha technique, the e-mail converted from the results will have *at least one of the sub-plurality of Web pages is copied into one of the plurality of e-mail messages.*

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Navin-Chandra technique by including the steps of automatically copying the Web page into the email then forwarding the email, using the technique of downloading the embedded objects as taught by Mantha, and by doing this, a user could query the Internet at one time and off-line retrieve the search result at another time.

Regarding to claim 12, Navin-Chandra teaches a method and system for searching in the Internet (Navin-Chandra, Col. 1, lines 15-23). According to Navin-Chandra method, a user operating at computer 202 submits a query to MSE 262 via an ISP 204 (Navin-Chandra, Col. 6, lines 30-34). MSE 262 uses the query to determine which IRs to access. It then parses and reformats the query into formats appropriate for the respective search engines on computers 210, 220 and 230, e.g., MSE 262 subsequently forwards an appropriately formatted query to the respective search engines (Navin-Chandra, Col. 6, lines 30-39). This illustrates the step of *receiving at least one search term; issuing a search request from the server to a search engine using the at least one search term*. After receiving the search term, each SE then interrogates their respective indices of the associated IRs and compiles a respective list of hits with associated ranks and summaries as shown in FIGS. 2A, 2B and 2C (Navin-Chandra, Col. 6, lines 30-48). Upon reception of the result lists, the MSE 262 will recover the hits, which are provided in the form of a cross reference to the location, i.e., a URL, of a particular IR to which the hit is associated for determining the documents that are pertinent to the query. The MSE 262 then communicates with the particular IRs storing the document, or other item of interest for downloading to the computer 260 (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 10-30). The technique as discussed indicates the steps of *receiving the hit list form the search engine; retrieving at least one Web page based on the hit list*. Navin-Chandra does not explicitly teach the steps of *forwarding the e-mail message to an end-user's terminal wherein the copy of the at least one Web page may be reviewed by the*

end-user; wherein the bundled at least one Web page includes a link to another retrieved Web page, and fails to teach a copy of the another retrieved Web page is also bundled into the e-mail message. However, as illustrated by Navin-Chandra, the results as discussed are downloaded, and may be transmitted to the user across lines 205 and 203, or transmitted through an alternate mode module 208 in FIG. 2, which is the user's specified mode of transmission. For example, the results may be converted into a facsimile, e-mail, or other document format specified by the user, and transmitted to the location specified by the user (Navin-Chandra, Col. 8, line 54-Col. 9, line 7). As shown in FIG. 1, IRs 140 and 150 depict browseable information sources. Access to IRs 140 and 150 is generally made directly via an appropriate Uniform Resource Locator (URL) or by cross references, i.e., a hypertext links, from other IRs (Navin-Chandra, Col. 5, lines 14-24). A hypertext link appears as a word or phrase distinguishable from the surrounding text by a color or format distinction, or both. A user is able to click on a hypertext link and be transferred to another information service, which is often remote from the site with the originating hypertext link. Through the use of many such hypertext links, sites with similar content can be easily cross-referenced by the web developer allowing a user quick access to supplementary information that is distributed across the Internet (Navin-Chandra, Col. 2, lines 23-40). This indicates the steps of *forwarding the e-mail message to an end-user's terminal wherein the copy of the at least one Web page may be reviewed by the end-user; wherein the bundled at least one Web page includes a link to another retrieved Web page.*

Mantha teaches a method for copying and saving a Web page according to a desired category to facilitate subsequent retrieval and display of the page (Mantha, Col. 2, lines 3-5). The copy of the Web page and each of its embedded objects will be saved on a client hard drive (Mantha, Col. 2, lines 12-14). Mantha further discloses: a copy of a Web page will be saved to the client local storage and several linked list for the hypertext references will be created in order to save the embedded objects of the Web page (Mantha, Col. 2, lines 45-62). Thus, the Navin-Chandra could be modified by downloading the embedded objects of the document from the IRs, and by using the Mantha technique, the e-mail converted from the results will have *a copy of the another retrieved Web page is also bundled into the e-mail message.*


Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Navin-Chandra technique by including the steps of automatically copying the Web page into the email then forwarding the email, using the technique of downloading the embedded objects as taught by Mantha, and by doing this, a user could query the Internet at one time and off-line retrieve the search result at another time.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung Pham whose telephone number is 703-605 4242. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00 Am - 3:30 Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, VU, KIM YEN can be reached on 703-305 4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746 7239 for regular communications and 703-746 7238 for After Final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305 3900.

Examiner: Hung Pham
December 23, 2002



JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER